

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment to the Claims, claims 1-22 and 24-31 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 7, 15, 17, 21, 24, and 28 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1, 7, 15, 21, 24, and 28 are sought to be amended. Claim 23 is sought to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Drawings

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, has indicated that the drawings filed are informal drawings. The Examiner has requested that formal drawings be submitted when the application is allowed. Therefore, Applicant will submit formal drawings upon allowance of the application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner, on page 3 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2005/0138106 to Crookham *et al.* (hereinafter "Crookham"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

To anticipate a claim of a pending application, a single reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1397 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The exclusion of a claimed element from the single source is enough to negate anticipation by that reference. *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner states that Crookham discloses Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Unlike the present invention, which teaches generating electronic reports, Crookham teaches a system and method for electronic scoring and score reporting of a sporting event, and provides the Internet, as a conduit, to communicate to and from the location of the sporting event field to control operations of the lighting and to monitor the lighting and other events at the location. *Crookham*, Abstract; paras. [0041] – [0045]. Crookham does not teach or suggest every element of Applicant's invention. For example, referring to independent claim 1, Crookham does not teach or suggest at least the following claimed elements:

- (a) receiving electronic data on a computing platform from at least one external source, wherein the electronic data relates to online activity;
- (b) inserting at least a portion of the collected data into one or more data fields, wherein said one or more data fields comprise an electronic scoreboard of interrelated data, with each of said data fields representing data that corresponds to a same or similar online activity.

The Examiner states that Crookham teaches Applicant's element of "receiving electronic data on a computing platform from at least one external source, wherein the electronic data relates to online activity," at Crookham, para. [0087]. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Unlike the present invention, Crookham teaches permitting the sports field to receive and send information over the network connection for remotely controlling

lighting, irrigation systems, other management systems and the electronic scorebook and scoreboard, *Crookham*, para. [0087], not receiving electronic data on a computing platform from at least one external source, *wherein the electronic data relates to online activity*.

The Examiner also states that Crookham teaches Applicant's element of "inserting at least a portion of the collected data into one or more data fields, wherein said one or more data fields comprise an electronic scoreboard of interrelated data, with each of said data fields representing data that corresponds to a same or similar online activity," at Crookham, paras. [0032] and [0033]. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Unlike the present invention, Crookham teaches scoreboards providing updated information concerning the status of sporting events and that room for improvement exists with regards to scoreboards because many of them are still manually operated, and both manually and electronically operated scoreboards may contain errors. *Crookham*, paras. [0032] – [0033]. Crookham does not appear to teach "data fields representing data that corresponds to a same or similar online activity," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 1.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 2-6), are patentable over Crookham. Independent claims 15, 24, and 28 recite similar elements to those recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 15, 24, and 28, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 16-20, claims 25-27, and claims 29-31, respectively) are also patentable over Crookham.

With respect to independent claim 7, Crookham does not teach or suggest at least the following claimed elements:

- (b) comparing at least a portion of the one or more measurement values to one or more threshold values;

The Examiner states that Applicant's comparing element is taught by Crookham in paras. [0078] and [0091]. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Unlike the present invention, Crookham, at para. [0078] teaches that "[t]he software could compile or display different information during a game based on a software evaluation of certain occurrences during the game or the course of the game." Crookham, at para. [0091], teaches that sports news can be provided from a source and selected by the scorebook system based on a predefined arrangement that is programmed into the scorebook. Nowhere in paras. [0078] and [0091] does Crookham teach or suggest "comparing ... one or more measurement values to one or more threshold values."

Thus, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 8-14), are patentable over Crookham. Independent claims 17 and 21 recite similar elements to those recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 17 and 21, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 18-20 and claim 22, respectively) are also patentable over Crookham.

With respect to independent claim 15, Crookham also does not teach or suggest at least the following claimed element:

- (c) assigning scores to at least a portion of the data contained in the plurality of data fields.

The Examiner states that Crookham teaches Applicant's element of "assigning scores to at least a portion of the data contained in the plurality of data fields," at Crookham, para. [0109]. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Unlike the present invention, Crookham, at para. [0109] teaches that owners or proprietors of lighting systems could

utilize existing or newly built elevated lighting systems to elevate a wireless base station and serve as basically a local Internet service provider. *Crookham*, para. [0109].

Thus, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 1, 7, 15, 17, 21, 24, and 28, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by *Crookham*. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 7, 15, 17, 21, 24, and 28, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 2-6, claims 8-14, claims 16-20, claim 22, claims 25-27, and claims 29-31, respectively).

Request for an Examiner Interview

Applicant respectfully requests an Examiner Interview. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the Applicant's representative at the number provided below to formally set a date and time to conduct the interview.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

/Crystal D. Sayles, Reg. No. 44,318/

Crystal D. Sayles
Senior Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
(202) 986-3179

Dated: May 1, 2006

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026